

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

### PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

Local Mitigation Plan requirements in §201.6 of the Interim Final Rule (Rule) apply to both local jurisdictions and Indian tribal governments (henceforth referred to as local jurisdictions). The local mitigation planning requirements in this section encourage agencies at all levels, local residents, businesses, and the non-profit sector to participate in the mitigation planning and implementation process. This broader public participation enables the development of mitigation measures that are supported by these various stakeholders and reflect the needs of the community. Private sector participation, in particular, may lead to identifying local funding that would not otherwise have been considered for mitigation activities.

As with State plans, the Rule criteria for the local plans require that communities only address natural hazards. Comprehensive mitigation plans, however, should consider man-made and technological hazards. In many instances, natural disasters have secondary effects, such as dams breaking due to floods, or hazardous material releases due to tornadoes. Multi-hazard plans will better prepare communities in the event of such disasters.

States are required to coordinate with local governments in the formation of hazard mitigation strategies, and the local strategies combined with initiatives at the State level form the basis for the State Mitigation Plan. With the information contained in local mitigation plans, States are better able to identify technical assistance needs and prioritize project funding. Furthermore, as communities prepare plans, States continually improve the level of detail and comprehensiveness in statewide risk-assessments.

Local jurisdictions must have approved plans by November 1, 2003 to be eligible for Hazard Mitigation Grant Program funding for Presidentially declared disasters after this date.

The sections covered in Part 3 – Local Mitigation Plans include:

- Prerequisites
- Planning Process
- Risk Assessment
- Mitigation Strategy
- Plan Maintenance Procedures

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

### PREREQUISITES

The local government submitting the plan must satisfy the following three prerequisites before the plan is reviewed by the State and/or FEMA. If these prerequisites have not been fulfilled, the plan cannot be reviewed.

### ADOPTION BY THE LOCAL GOVERNING BODY

**Requirement**  
**§201.6(c)(5):**

[The local hazard mitigation plan shall include] documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan (e.g., City Council, County Commissioner, Tribal Council)...

**Explanation:**

Adoption by the local governing body demonstrates the jurisdiction's commitment to fulfilling the mitigation goals and objectives outlined in the plan. Adoption legitimizes the plan and authorizes responsible agencies to execute their responsibilities. The plan must include a copy of the resolution adopting the plan.

**Resource:**

For more information about adopting the mitigation plan, see:

✓ *Bringing the Plan to Life* (FEMA 386-4).

**Scoring:**

- ☐ Not Met. The plan has not been formally adopted by the local governing body.
- ☐ Not Met. The plan has been formally adopted by the local governing body, but a copy of the signed plan adoption resolution is not included.
- ☐ Met. The plan has been formally adopted by the local governing body and a copy of the signed plan adoption resolution is included.

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

### MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL PLAN ADOPTION

---

<b>Requirement §201.6(c)(5):</b>	For multi-jurisdictional plans, each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan must document that it has been formally adopted.
----------------------------------	--

**Explanation:** In order for multi-jurisdictional plans to be approved, each jurisdiction that is included in the plan must have its governing body adopt the plan before submission to the State and FEMA, even when a regional agency has the authority to prepare such plans in the name of the respective jurisdictions.

**Resource:** For more information about adopting the mitigation plan, see:  
✓ *Bringing the Plan to Life* (FEMA 386-4).

**Scoring:**

- ☐ Not Met. The plan has not been formally adopted by each local governing body.
- ☐ Not Met. The plan has been formally adopted by the local governing body, but a copy of the signed plan adoption resolutions is not included.
- ☐ Met. The plan has been formally adopted by each local governing body and a copy of each of the signed plan adoption resolutions is included.

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

### MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL PLANNING PARTICIPATION

---

**Requirement  
§201.6(a)(3)**

Multi-jurisdictional plans (e.g., watershed plans) may be accepted, as appropriate, as long as each jurisdiction has participated in the process... Statewide plans will not be accepted as multi-jurisdictional plans.

**Explanation:**

A multi-jurisdictional plan, as prepared by regional planning and development authorities (e.g. watershed/river basin commission), is acceptable as a Local Mitigation Plan under DMA 2000. However, the plan will be rejected if all of the jurisdictions encompassed in the plan do not participate in its development. Therefore, the plan must document how each jurisdiction participated in the planning process.

**Resource:**

For more information on initiating a comprehensive local mitigation planning process, see:

✓ *Getting Started* (FEMA 386-1).

**Scoring:**

- ☐ Not Met. Not all of the affected jurisdictions actively participated in the planning process.
- ☐ Met. All of the affected jurisdictions actively participated in the planning process.

## **PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS**

### **PLANNING PROCESS**

§201.4(b) and §201.4(c)(1) require that there be an open public involvement process in the formation of a plan. This includes opportunities for the public to comment on the plan at all stages of its formation, and the involvement of any neighboring communities, interested agencies, or private and non-profit organizations. This should also include a review of any existing plans or studies and incorporation of these if appropriate. Documentation of the planning process, including how the plan was prepared, who was involved in the process, and how the public was involved is essential.

This section includes the following subsection:

- Documentation of the Planning Process

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

### DOCUMENTATION OF THE PLANNING PROCESS

#### **IFR Requirement §201.6(c)(1):**

[The plan must document] the planning process used to develop the plan, including how it was prepared, who was involved in the process, and how the public was involved.

#### **Explanation:**

A description of the planning process should include how the plan was prepared, who was involved in the planning process, and the timeframe for preparing the plan.

The plan should document how the planning team was formed and the number and outcomes of the meetings the planning team held. Ideally, the local mitigation planning team is composed of local, State, and federal agency representatives, as well as community representatives, local business leaders, and educators.

In addition to the core team preparing the plan, it is also important to indicate how the public (residents, businesses, and other interested parties) participated, including what means (e.g., WebPages, storefronts, toll free phone lines, etc.) were made available to those who could not attend public forums to voice concerns or provide input during the planning process.

#### **Resource:**

For more information on the planning process; ideas on finding stakeholders, generating public interest, enlisting partners, and choosing an appropriate public participation model; and advice to local governments seeking to initiate a comprehensive local mitigation planning process, see:

✓ *Getting Started* (FEMA 386-1).

#### **Examples:**



#### **Original Submittal:**

The Friendly County Planning Department has developed a local hazard mitigation plan. The Planning Department formed a planning team comprised of representatives from FEMA Region XX, State government, local City governments, community groups, local businesses, and the State University, which is located in Friendly County. The plan was developed over one year.

### REVIEWER'S COMMENTS

DMA SECTION	CORRESPONDING PLAN SECTION	IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED
§201.6(c)(1)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The planning process included representatives from many organizations, but there is no mention of public involvement or details on the</li></ul>

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

		planning process.
--	--	-------------------

### Required Revisions:

To receive a satisfactory score, the plan must include specifics on the planning process and discuss public involvement.



### Revised Submittal:

Friendly County has developed a local hazard mitigation plan. The County Planning Department was responsible for development of the plan. The Planning Department formed a planning team comprised of representatives from FEMA Region XX, State government, local City governments, community groups, local businesses, and the State University, which is located in Friendly County (see Appendix XX for a list of team members). This team met every two weeks for three months and once a month thereafter. The plan was developed over one year.

An effort was made to solicit public input during the planning process and four public meetings were held during the formation of the plan: one at the beginning, one after a first draft was produced, and one after a final draft was produced. Citizens could also access the County Hazard Mitigation Plan website to provide input.

The State University assisted greatly in the development of the plan by providing graduate students from the Urban Studies and Planning Department to help County Planning Department Staff. These students helped organize the public meetings and maintained the website.

Feedback received from the public proved valuable in the development of the plan. Several comments were received that led to the rethinking of some of proposed priority mitigation actions including some from residents of the rural southern portion of the county that illustrated the need for assistance with maintaining drainage channels. As access to this very rural area is by one-lane or gravel roads, it is often overlooked by the County Public Works Office. During the last heavy rainfall several of the small creeks were blocked by debris, causing backup flooding of several of the properties. Maintenance and clearing of channels are activities that are now included in the flood hazard portion of the Hazard Mitigation Plan.

**(THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK)**



### RISK ASSESSMENT

§201.6(c)(2) of the Rule outlines specific information that local jurisdictions must consider when completing the risk assessment portion of the plan. Local risk assessments must provide sufficient information to enable the jurisdiction to identify and prioritize appropriate mitigation actions to reduce losses from identified hazards. This includes detailed descriptions of all the hazards that could affect the jurisdiction along with an analysis of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to those hazards. Specific information about numbers and types of structures, potential dollar losses, and an overall description of land use trends in the jurisdiction must be included in this analysis. For multi-jurisdictional plans, any risks that affect only certain sections of the planning areas must be assessed separately in the context of the affected area.

This section includes the following six subsections as follows:

- Identifying Hazards
- Profiling Hazard Events
- Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Assets
- Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses
- Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends
- Multi-jurisdictional Risk Assessment

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

### IDENTIFYING HAZARDS

<b>Requirement</b> <b>§201.6(c)(2)(i):</b>	[The risk assessment shall include a] description of the type ... of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction...
---	--

**Explanation:** The local risk assessment should identify what hazards are likely to affect the area. The plan should describe the sources used to identify hazards, noting any data limitations, and provide an explanation for eliminating any hazards from consideration. The process for identifying hazards could involve one or more of the following:

- Reviewing reports, plans, flood ordinances, and land use regulations among others;
- Talking to experts from federal, State, and local agencies and universities;
- Searching the Internet and newspapers; and
- Interviewing long-time residents.

**Resources:** For more information on identifying hazards, see:

- ✓ *Understanding Your Risks* (FEMA 386-2), Step 1.
- ✓ *Integrating Human-Caused Disasters into Mitigation Planning* (FEMA 386-7), Phase 2.

**Examples:**



**Original Submittal:**

Friendly County has identified several hazards to be addressed in the County's Hazard Mitigation Plan. These hazards were identified during the development of the County's plan based on input from Planning Committee members, and were determined to be the hazards that present the highest risk for the County.

The Friendly County Mitigation Plan addresses the following hazards:

- Hurricanes;
- Flooding;
- Coastal Erosion; and
- Terrorism.

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

### REVIEWER'S COMMENTS

DMA SECTION	CORRESPONDING PLAN SECTION	IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED
§201.6(c)(2) (i)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The County did not indicate how or why the hazards were identified.</li> <li>▪ It is not clear if the County identified all relevant hazards.</li> </ul>

#### Required Revisions:

Document the process followed to identify and/or eliminate hazards for consideration.



#### Revised Submittal:

Friendly County identified several hazards **that are** addressed in the County's Hazard Mitigation Plan. These hazards were identified **through an extensive process that utilized input from Planning Committee members (comprised of representatives from FEMA Region XX, County agencies, City governments, local businesses, community groups, State Emergency Management Offices, and the State University), public input, researching past disaster declarations in the County, a review of current FIRMs, and risk assessments completed by the County Emergency Management Agency.**

**In addition, the County Planning Agency is developing a GIS database that will map the County's infrastructure, critical facilities, and land uses. Initial data from this study was also used to determine those hazards that present the greatest risk to the County.**

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

The following table identifies the hazards.

Hazard	<i>How identified</i>	<i>Why identified</i>
Hurricanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Review of past disaster declarations</li><li>• Input from County Department of Natural Resources</li><li>• Input from residents</li><li>• Risk Assessments</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The County is hit almost every year by a hurricane</li><li>• Hurricanes have caused damage (personal and property), flooding, and evacuation situations</li></ul>
Flooding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Review of FIRMs</li><li>• Input from County Planning Office</li><li>• Risk Assessments</li><li>• Public input</li><li>• Review of past disaster declarations</li><li>• Identification of NFIP repetitive loss properties in the County</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Associated with the effects of hurricanes, which hit the County frequently</li><li>• Several repetitive loss properties are located in the County</li><li>• The County contains many rivers and streams, and is located along the coast</li></ul>
Coastal Erosion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Input from County Planning Office</li><li>• Input from County Department of Natural Resources</li><li>• Input from the State University (conducting shoreline research)</li><li>• Public input</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The County is undergoing development pressure along the coast</li><li>• Coastline stabilization measures have been implemented in the past year</li><li>• Related to hurricane frequency</li></ul>
Terrorism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Input from local utility company</li><li>• Public input</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Nuclear power plant is located in the County</li><li>• Heightened sense of security since September 2001</li></ul>

**(THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK)**

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

### PROFILING HAZARD EVENTS

---

<b>Requirement</b> <b>§201.6(c)(2)(i):</b>	[The risk assessment shall include a] description of the ... location and extent of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction. The plan shall include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events.
---	---

**Explanation:** When appropriate, the hazard analysis should also identify on a map the areas affected by each identified hazard. Additionally, a composite map should be provided for hazards with a recognizable geographic extent (i.e., hazards that are known to occur in particular areas of the jurisdiction, such as floods, coastal storms, wildfires, tsunamis, and landslides). For those hazards not geographically determined, plans should indicate their applicable intensity. For example, in areas where tornadoes occur, plans should indicate their maximum wind speed.

The plan should provide a discussion of past occurrences of hazard events in or near the community in terms of their severity and resulting effects.

The plans should also describe the analysis used to determine the probability of occurrence and magnitude of future hazard events. The plans should characterize each hazard and include the following information:

- The probability or likelihood that the hazard event would affect an area;
- The magnitude or severity of the hazard events;
- The geographical extent or areas in the community that would be affected; and
- The conditions, such as topography, soil characteristics, meteorological conditions, etc., in the area that make it prone to hazards.

The analysis should be detailed enough to allow identification of the areas of the jurisdiction that are most severely affected by each hazard.

**Resource:** For more information on profiling hazards, see:

- ✓ *Understanding Your Risks* (FEMA 386-2), Step 2.

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

### Examples:



#### Original Submittal:

Sandy County is subject to riverine and flash flooding throughout large sections of the County. There have been several flooding incidents in the County. A severe flash flood occurred in June of 2000, and the Mud River reached 100-year flood levels in 1996.

Many factors within the County affect the type and severity of flooding, including the mountains, the location of development, the amount of snow and rainfall received, and the large, wide floodplain of the Mud River.

#### REVIEWER'S COMMENTS

DMA SECTION	CORRESPONDING PLAN SECTION	IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED
§201.6(c)(2)(i)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Although the factors affecting the severity of flooding were listed, no details of their presence or location in the County were provided.</li><li>The County did not provide a map identifying areas affected by flooding.</li><li>A limited history of flooding was discussed.</li></ul>

#### Required Revisions:

For a satisfactory score, the plan should document the process used to determine differences in vulnerability to the hazard, differentiate the ways in which areas of the County are affected, and provide a map or other tool to delineate hazard areas.



#### Revised Submittal:

~~Sandy County is subject to riverine and flash flooding throughout large sections of the County. There have been several flooding incidents in the County. A severe flash flood occurred in June of 2000, and the Mud River reached 100-year flood levels in 1996.~~

~~Many factors within the County affect the type and severity of flooding, including the mountains, the location of development, the amount of snow and rainfall received, and the large, wide floodplain of the Mud River.~~

Sandy County is subject to riverine and flash flooding. **The County Planning Department has reviewed the County's Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) and Flood Insurance Study (FIS), and has worked with the local college to compile a profile of the flooding hazard in the County. The college provided support by completing research on flooding history in the County and entering this data into a GIS**

## **PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS**

database. The GIS program shows the extent and areas affected by past flooding, and is overlain by County tax maps. This, along with the County's FIRMs and FIS, provides a clear picture of areas and structures most vulnerable to flooding. *(See attached Map X.X, Areas of Sandy County subject to Flood Hazards).*

### **Flash Flooding**

The western section of the County is very mountainous with steep slopes and stream valleys. This area receives several large thunderstorms per year that cause intense rainfall for short periods of time, resulting in water flowing down from the mountains, collecting in, and sometimes overtopping the valley streams. There have also been issues with the maintenance and clearing of drainage channels in this area that have resulted in obstructions restricting the flow of water during a storm. Although this area is fairly rural, many of the residents live in the 100-year floodplain because of the steep slopes. These conditions make response and evacuation operations very difficult, adversely affecting the safety of residents.

The most recent incident occurred in June of 2000. A severe thunderstorm produced significant localized rainfall. Two small bridges were washed out and many County residents were stranded. Although no one was injured, several structures were flooded and many residents were cut off from the rest of the County. This event was estimated at a 25-year flood elevation.

### **Riverine Flooding**

The central and eastern sections of the County are subject to riverine flooding. This is usually caused by extensive rainfall over a period of several days and can be worsened by snowmelt conditions. The Mud River located in Sandy County has flooded 12 times in the past 75 years; one was a 200-year level, four were 100-year levels, three were 50-year levels, and four were 10-year levels. The 200-year flood occurred in 1952 and resulted in significant damage to Iron City and Silvertown. The most recent flood was a 100-year level flood that occurred in 1996.

The area surrounding the Mud River is subject to flood damage because of the large amounts of rainfall and snowmelt it receives; the wide, flat floodplain; and the large numbers of structures located in the floodplain.



## **PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS**

**(THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK)**

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

### ASSESSING VULNERABILITY: IDENTIFYING ASSETS

---

<b>Requirement</b> <b>§201.6(c)(2) (ii)(A):</b>	<p>[The risk assessment shall include a] description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph (c)(2)(i) of this section. This description shall include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community. The plan should describe vulnerability in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ The types and numbers of existing and future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas...</li></ul>
--	---

<b>Explanation:</b>	<p>This information list should be based on an inventory of existing and proposed structures within the community and/or an estimate of those located within identified hazard boundaries. The information should include critical facilities, such as shelters and hospitals, and infrastructure, such as roadways, water, utilities, and communication systems. The community should determine how far into the future they wish to go in considering proposed structures, including planned and approved development. It may be based on information in their comprehensive plan or land use plan. The community should determine how best to indicate structures that are vulnerable to more than one hazard.</p>
---------------------	---

<b>Special Considerations:</b>	<p>While the Rule does not require a discussion about the number of people or special populations at risk, such as the elderly, disabled, or lower income, the risk assessment should include them to enable the development of appropriate actions to assist such populations during or after a disaster. However, a lack of inclusion or a less than thorough coverage will not penalize the applicant.</p>
--------------------------------	---

<b>Resource:</b>	<p>For a discussion on identifying vulnerable structures, see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>✓ <i>Understanding Your Risks</i> (FEMA 386-2), Step 3.</li></ul>
------------------	--

#### Examples



#### Original Submittal:

Rocky County is susceptible to flooding and fire hazards. The Planning Department compiled a list of critical facilities in the County and determined whether they were likely to be impacted by hazards. They found several critical facilities in the County were susceptible to damage from flooding, including five storm shelters, one hospital, the local communication utility company, one wastewater treatment plant, and an old industrial site containing hazardous waste. Critical facilities that would be damaged by fire include one school and one hospital located in the rural, wooded portion of the County.

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

### REVIEWER'S COMMENTS

DMA SECTION	CORRESPONDING PLAN SECTION	IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED
§201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The plan did not indicate how the critical facilities were identified.</li></ul>

#### Required Revisions:

The plan should show how the critical facilities were identified and include a map showing the location of the facilities and the hazard(s) to which they are susceptible.

The vulnerability assessment should address future planned development. Although not a requirement, it would be useful for the plan to address the presence of any special populations.



#### Revised Submittal:

~~Rocky County is susceptible to flooding and fire hazards. The Planning Department compiled a list of critical facilities in the County and determined whether they were likely to be impacted by hazards.~~

The Hazard Mitigation Plan for Rocky County identifies critical facilities located in the County and the hazards to which these facilities are susceptible. **A critical facility is defined as a facility in either the public or private sector that provides essential products and services to the general public, is otherwise necessary to preserve the welfare and quality of life in the County, or fulfills important public safety, emergency response, and/or disaster recovery functions.**

The critical facilities identified in the County are storm shelters; hospitals and other health care facilities; gas, electric, and communication utilities; water and wastewater treatment plants; hazardous waste sites; and schools **(see attached map XX Critical Facilities and Hazard Vulnerability).**

**The Rocky County Planning Department used GIS and other modeling tools to map the county's critical facilities and determine which are most likely to be affected by hazards.** The two hazards most likely to impact the County are flooding and wildfires. **The analysis revealed the following:**

- Flooding Hazard: A 100-year flood** would have an impact on five storm shelters, one hospital, **one elderly housing project**, the local communication utility company, one wastewater treatment plant, and an old industrial site containing hazardous waste.
- Fire Hazard: Brush fires** could have an impact on one school and

## **PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS**

one hospital located in the rural, wooded portion of the County.

**In addition to critical facilities, the County contains at risk populations that should be factored into a vulnerability assessment. These include a relatively large population of elderly residents with limited mobility.**

**An analysis of the County Comprehensive Plan indicates that there is a slight but constant increase in residents expected over the next 20 years. Most of the residential development is expected to occur in the already developed areas outside of the 100-year floodplain.**

## **PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS**

**(THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK)**

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

### ASSESSING VULNERABILITY: ESTIMATING POTENTIAL LOSSES

**Requirement §201.6(c)(2) (ii)(B):** [The plan should describe vulnerability in terms of an] estimate of the potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures identified in paragraph (c)(2)(i)(A) of this section and a description of the methodology used to prepare the estimate...

**Explanation:** Describing vulnerability in terms of dollar losses provides the community and the State with a common framework in which to measure the effects of hazards on assets. The plan should include an estimate of losses for the identified vulnerable assets. An estimate should be provided for each hazard, and should include, when resources permit, structure, contents, and function losses to present a full picture of the total loss for each asset.

**Special Considerations:** While the Rule does not require it, the plan should include a composite loss map to show high potential loss areas

**Resource:** For a step-by-step method for estimating losses, see:  
✓ *Understanding Your Risks* (FEMA 386-2), Step 4.

#### Examples:



#### Original Submittal:

The Rocky County Planning Department has used GIS modeling, field inspections, and historical data to estimate the potential dollar losses if the County were to experience flooding and wildfires, the two most likely hazards to occur in the County. The vulnerable structures and facilities were identified earlier in the planning process.

The County will have an estimated \$10 million dollars damage during a major flood, and an estimated \$3 million dollars damage in the case of a severe wildfire.

### REVIEWER'S COMMENTS

DMA SECTION	CORRESPONDING PLAN SECTION	IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED
§201.6(c)(2) (ii)(B):		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ The plan did not specify which structures/facilities would be damaged, and by what hazard.</li><li>▪ The costs were not broken down for each asset likely to be damaged.</li></ul>

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

### Required Revisions:

The plan must include an estimate for each structure and/or facility likely to be damaged. Although not a requirement, a map showing the assets likely to be damaged, along with estimates of damage, would be helpful.



### Revised Submittal:

The Rocky County Planning Department has used GIS modeling, field inspections, and historical data to estimate the potential dollar losses if the County were to experience flooding and wildfires, the two most likely hazards to occur in the County. The vulnerable structures and facilities were identified earlier in the planning process. ~~The County will have an estimated \$10 million dollars damage during a major flood, and an estimated \$3 million dollars damage in the case of a severe wildfire.~~ **The County used the guidelines in the FEMA document *Understanding Your Risks: Identifying Hazards and Estimating Losses* to develop a cost estimate for damage. The estimated costs are as follows:**

#### Potential flood losses:

- Residential properties (including senior citizens home): \$2.5 million
- Local hospital: \$3 million
- Schools: \$2 million
- Communication utility company: \$1 million
- Waste water treatment plant: \$1.5 million

See attached map XX, Estimated Flood Losses by Location and Type of Asset.

#### Potential Wildfire losses:

- Residential properties: \$1 million
- Hospital: \$1.5 million
- Secondary school: \$500,000

See attached map XY, Estimated Wildfire Losses by Location and Type of Asset.

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

### ASSESSING VULNERABILITY: ANALYZING DEVELOPMENT TRENDS

**Requirement §201.6(c)(2) (ii)(C):** [The plan should describe vulnerability in terms of] providing a general description of land uses and development trends within the community so that mitigation options can be considered in future land use decisions.

**Explanation:** The plan should provide a general overview of land uses and types of development occurring within the community. This can include existing and proposed land uses as well as development densities in the identified hazard areas and any anticipated future changes. This information provides a basis for making decisions on the type of mitigation approaches to consider, and the locations in which these approaches should be applied. This information can also be used to influence decisions regarding future development in hazard areas.

**Resource:** For more information on development trends, see:  
✓ *Developing the Plan* (FEMA 386-3).

#### Examples:



#### Original Submittal:

Friendly County is centrally located in the State and is largely rural; the main land use is farming. Jasperville City is located along the northern border of the County along the Big River.

Other land uses within the County include industrial and commercial areas, residential areas, park land and open space, and specialized land use categories (institutional, mixed-use).

The County has been dealing with some residential development pressure in the region surrounding Jasperville. Otherwise the County does not expect any significant changes in land use or development pressure.

#### REVIEWER'S COMMENTS

DMA SECTION	CORRESPONDING PLAN SECTION	IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED
§201.6(c)(2) (ii)(C)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Although the plan lists the land uses it does not give an indication of where the land uses are relative to hazard areas, and whether there is any anticipated change in land uses.</li></ul>

#### Required Revisions:

To receive a satisfactory score, the plan must provide more specifics on the land use types and locations and indicate if there are any planned



## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

changes, particularly in or near hazard areas.



### Revised Submittal:

Friendly county is centrally located in the State and is largely rural. A majority of the County's land use is designated as farmland. The largest city, Jasperville, is located along the northern boundary of the county along the Big River. The land uses within the county consist of: industrial and commercial areas, **located in and around Jasperville**; residential areas, **located in the suburbs surrounding Jasperville**; park land and open space, **located largely in the eastern section of the county**; farmland, **which is a majority of the County**; and specialized land use designations (institutional, mixed-use) **located in the City**.

~~The County has been dealing with some residential development pressure in the region surrounding Jasperville.~~ The suburbs of Jasperville have recently undergone residential development pressure **as several large companies have opened offices in the City within the past year, attracting new residents to the area. The County Planning Office has indicated that the residential development pressure surrounding Jasperville is the largest concern with respect to future land use decisions and hazard mitigation planning. The Big River floods periodically and many of the newly developing residential areas are located in close proximity to the Big River.**

~~Otherwise the County does not expect any changes in land use or development pressure.~~ **The remainder of the County is not expected to undergo development pressure, and the Planning Office does not anticipate any significant changes in land use.**

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

### MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL RISK ASSESSMENT

---

**Requirement §201.6(c)(2) (iii):** For multi-jurisdictional plans, the risk assessment section must assess each jurisdiction's risks where they vary from the risks facing the entire planning area.

**Explanation:** The multi-jurisdictional plan can present information for the general planning area as a whole as described in the previous paragraphs. However, where hazards and associated losses occur in only part of the planning area, this information should be attributed to the particular jurisdiction in which they occur. Further, where unique construction characteristics occur, they should be indicated on the plan so that appropriate mitigation measures are considered.

**Resource:** For more information on creating a detailed risk assessment, see:  
✓ *Understanding Your Risks* (FEMA 386-2).

**Examples:**



**Original Submittal:**

Rumble County is a large county centrally located in the State. As such, there are several separate jurisdictions within the County. All of these jurisdictions contributed to the risk assessment analyses performed for the County Hazard Mitigation Plan (see preceding Section XX).

All jurisdictions within the County are subject to riverine flooding, which has been determined to be the greatest risk for the County.

#### REVIEWER'S COMMENTS

CMA SECTION	CORRESPONDING PLAN SECTION	IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED
§201.6(c)(2) (iii)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The plan does not indicate if any of the contributing jurisdictions faced additional risks, or if they were affected differently by flooding.</li></ul>

**Required Revisions:**

To receive a satisfactory score, the plan must document if any particular jurisdictions are subject to additional risks or if they have unique situations that require special consideration.

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS



### Revised Submittal:

Rumble County is a large county centrally located in the State. Within the County, there are several municipalities. All of these jurisdictions contributed to the risk assessment analyses performed for the County Hazard Mitigation Plan (see preceding Section XX).

~~All jurisdictions within the County are subject to riverine flooding, which has been determined to be the greatest risk for the County.~~

**Riverine flooding was identified as the most significant risk to the County and is addressed in the Mitigation Plan. However, two jurisdictions within the County have unique situations that require additional mitigation measures. Separate risk assessments were performed for each jurisdiction.**

**Rocky Township, located in the southern section of the County, is subject to additional flooding hazards due to its history as a mining town. Rocky Township was heavily mined in the early 1900's and has several abandoned mines in the area. Heavy rainfall causes runoff from the mines, threatening the township's water supply with contamination from acid mine drainage. Therefore, the remediation of water contamination identified in the Mitigation Plan is limited to Rocky Township.**

**Rocky Township has been recognized by the State Historic Preservation Office as being a Heritage Preservation and Tourism Area because of its distinct, historic character. The township's downtown appears much as it did in the early 1900's. However, the township has several threatened historic structures, some of which lie in the town's 100-year floodplain. One such structure is the Rocky Mining Company Shipping Office, which now serves as a museum chronicling the township's mining past. The elevation of the structure's first floor lies five feet below the 100-year flood elevation.**

**Quartz City contains a nuclear power plant that supplies power to the entire County. This power plant presents additional risks due to terrorism or malfunction of the plant's safety controls. The increased security and radiation control measures identified in the Mitigation Plan are limited to Quartz City.**

**(THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK)**

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

### MITIGATION STRATEGY

§201.6(c)(3) of the Rule outlines measures that localities must take in developing their mitigation strategies. Specifically, the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan must “include a mitigation strategy that provides the jurisdiction’s blueprint for reducing the potential losses identified in the risk assessment, based on existing authorities, policies, programs and resources, and its ability to expand on and improve these existing tools.”

This entails the development of goals from which specific mitigation actions and projects will be derived. All mitigation actions must be prioritized according to a cost-benefit analysis, with a focus on how effective the actions are expected to be with respect to their cost. For multi-jurisdictional plans, each jurisdiction must show the specific actions they will undertake.

This section includes the following four subsections as follows:

- Local Hazard Mitigation Goals
- Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Measures
- Implementation of Mitigation Measures
- Multi-jurisdictional Mitigation Strategy

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

### LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION GOALS

---

<b>Requirement</b> <b>§201.6(c)(3) (i):</b>	[The hazard mitigation strategy shall include: a] description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards.
--	---

**Explanation:** The community's hazard reduction goals, as reflected in the plan, along with their corresponding objectives, guide the development and implementation of mitigation measures. This section should describe what these goals are and how they were developed. The goals could be developed early in the planning process and refined based on the risk assessment findings, or developed entirely after the risk assessment is completed. They should also be compatible with the goals of the community as expressed in other community plan documents.

Although the Rule language does not require a description of objectives, communities are highly encouraged to include a description of the objectives developed to achieve the goals so that reviewers understand the connection between goals, objectives, and activities.

The goals and objectives should:

- Be based on the findings of the local and State risk assessments; and
- Represent a long-term vision for hazard reduction or enhancement of mitigation capabilities.

**Resource:** For more information on identifying local goals and objectives, see:

- ✓ *Getting Started* (FEMA 386-1).

For more information on refining local mitigation goals and objectives, see:

- ✓ *Developing a Mitigation Plan* (FEMA 386-3).

#### Examples:

<b>Special Considerations</b>	<p><b>Goals</b> are general guidelines that explain what you want to achieve. They are usually long-term and represent global visions, such as “eliminate flood damage.”</p> <p><b>Objectives</b> define strategies or implementation steps to attain the identified goals. Unlike goals, objectives are specific, measurable, and have a defined completion date. Objectives are more specific, such as “adopt a zoning ordinance prohibiting new development in the floodplain.”</p> <p>(From <i>Getting Started</i> [FEMA 386-1], Step 4)</p>
-------------------------------	--

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS



### Original Submittal:

The Rumble County Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee identified several goals that will serve as guidelines for the implementation of the County's hazard mitigation strategies.

The goals are as follows:

- Minimize future damage due to flooding of the Big River;
- Minimize damage to crops due to drought situations; and
- Reduce the threat of contamination from the nuclear power plant.

### REVIEWER'S COMMENTS

DMA SECTION	CORRESPONDING PLAN SECTION	IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED
§201.6(c)(3)(i):		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ There is no explanation for how the goals were developed.</li><li>▪ The plan does not mention objectives that will be used to achieve the goals.</li></ul>

### Required Revisions:

To receive a satisfactory score, the plan should describe how the goals were developed. Additionally, it would be helpful to include the objectives that will be used to achieve the goals.

### Revised Submittal:

The Rumble County Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee ~~identified several goals that will serve as guidelines for the implementation of the County's hazard mitigation strategies.~~ held a 2-day charette to review and analyze the risk assessment studies that were performed for the County. The goals listed were determined to be those that would have the greatest benefit in hazard reduction to the County. The goals, objectives, and actions for each are as follows:

~~The goals are as follows:~~

- **Goal 1:** Reduce flood damage in the County.
  - **Objective 1.1:** Minimize future damage due to flooding of the Big River.
    - **Action 1.1.1:** Place a restrictive clause in the County Ordinance that will prohibit development in the Big River floodplain.
      - Timeframe: 6 months

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

- Funding: No additional funding required
  - Staff: Planning Department personnel will work with County Administrator.
- **Action 1.1.2:** Work with existing floodplain residents to elevate or floodproof their structures, including obtaining funding assistance and technical guidance.
  - Timeframe: 2 years
  - Funding: HMGP/FMA funds
  - Staff: 1 full-time Planning Department employee.
- **Action 1.1.3:** Work with property owners to implement deed restrictions for open lots/vacant properties along the Big River to prevent development. Timeframe- ongoing, Funding –no additional funding required, Staff- Planning Department Staff.
- **Goal 2: Reduce economic impact of droughts.**
  - **Objective 2.1:** Minimize damage to local crops due to drought situations.
    - **Action 2.2.1:** Develop water-rationing measures that will be implemented during a drought situation.
      - Timeframe: 1 year
      - Funding: No additional funding required
      - Staff: 1 full-time member from Department of the Environment.
    - **Action 2.2.2:** Educate residents on the benefits of conserving water at all times, not just during a drought.
      - Timeframe: 1 year
      - Funding: State Mitigation Fund
      - Staff: ½ time of staff member from Department of the Environment.
    - **Action 2.2.3:** Work with local farmers to investigate the use of more drought-resistant crops. Timeframe- ongoing, Funding- no additional funds required, Staff- students from agronomy program at State University in conjunction with 1 full-time



## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

Planning Department staff member.

- **Goal 3: Reduce the threat of contamination from the nuclear power plant.**
  - **Objective 3.1:** Maintain the safe operation of the nuclear power plant located in the County.
    - **Action 3.3.1:** Work with power plant administrators to increase security measures necessary to prevent a terrorist attack.
      - Timeframe: 6 months
      - Funding: No additional funding required
      - Staff: ½ time of staff member from Building Department.
    - **Action 3.3.2:** Develop radiation safety protocols to be used in case of an emergency and educate the community on the use of these protocols.
      - Timeframe: 1 year
      - Funding: Donations from power plant
      - Staff: 1 full-time staff member from power plant.
    - **Action 3.3.3:** Work with power plant safety inspectors to ensure that the power plant is meeting or exceeding all safety requirements and develop a plan for enforcing these requirements if necessary.
      - Timeframe: 3 months
      - Funding: No additional funds required
      - Staff: 1 full-time inspector from power plant, ½ time of staff member from Building Department.
    - **Action 3.3.4:** Conduct a local public relations campaign to educate residents about the power plant, clearly delineating real threats from imagined.
      - Timeframe: Ongoing
      - Funding: Power plant will provide funds
      - Staff: ½ time of power plant staff member.

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

### IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSIS OF MITIGATION MEASURES

---

**Requirement**  
**§201.6(c)(3) (ii):**

[The mitigation strategy shall include a] section that identifies and analyzes a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects being considered to reduce the effects of each hazard, with particular emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure.

**Explanation:**

The local jurisdiction should list potential loss reduction activities it has identified in its planning process and describe its approach to evaluating these activities to select those that achieve the community's goals and objectives. Particular attention should be given to those mitigation activities that address existing and new buildings and infrastructure.

Not all of the mitigation measures identified may ultimately be included in the community's plan due to prohibitive costs, scale, low benefit/cost analysis ratios, or other concerns. The process by which the community decides on particular mitigation measures must be described. The information will also be valuable as part of the alternative analysis for the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review required if projects are federally funded.

**Resource:**

For more details on the mitigation action evaluation process, see:

✓ See *Developing a Mitigation Plan* (FEMA 386-3), Step 2.

**Examples:**



**Original Submittal:**

The City of Rolling Hills has identified several hazard mitigation projects that would benefit the City. The Planning Group has identified the following actions for the City of Rolling Hills:

- Acquisition and relocation of flood-prone structures;
- Removal of repetitive loss properties and preservation of the land as open space along the Big River;
- Develop new practices for drainage conveyance, slope excavation, and grading;
- Build tornado shelters; and
- Recommend better anchoring methods for manufactured housing.

Implementation of these projects will help Rolling Hills be less prone to damage from natural hazards.

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

### REVIEWER'S COMMENTS

DMA SECTION	CORRESPONDING PLAN SECTION	IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED
§201.6(c)(3) (ii)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The plan did not indicate how or why the actions were selected.</li> <li>▪ It is also unclear if all of the recommendations will be implemented, or only those that are determined to be the most beneficial after a cost-benefit analysis for each action has been completed.</li> </ul>

#### Required Revisions:

To receive a satisfactory score, the plan should describe how the actions were identified, and how the community will decide which measures to implement.



#### Revised Submittal:

The City of Rolling Hills has identified several hazard mitigation projects that would benefit the City **and will be formalized in the City Hazard Mitigation Plan. These were identified in the Planning Group Meetings, which included input from local government agencies, county government, the local college, and residents. The hazard-prone areas and the mitigation actions suggested for each are as follows:**

- **Eastern Neighborhood:** Located along the Big River and prone to overbank flooding. Recommend acquisition and relocation of flood-prone structures and repetitive loss properties. Focus on preservation and expansion of the created open space along the river.
- **Western Neighborhood:** Located in the foothills and prone to landslides. City Natural Resource Agency will conduct research to determine best management practices regarding drainage conveyance, slope excavation, and grading practices that reduce the risk of landslides. Work to incorporate these findings into the City development ordinances.
- **Southern Neighborhood:** Prone to tornado damage. Form task force to study shelter design and reinforcement and anchoring of manufactured homes. Disseminate the information to residents and provide funding to residents to assist them in complying with the recommendations.

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

### IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES

---

**Requirement:**  
**§201.6(c)(3) (iii):**

[The mitigation strategy section shall include] an action plan describing how the actions identified in section (c)(3)(ii) will be prioritized, implemented, and administered by the local jurisdiction. Prioritization shall include a special emphasis on the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost benefit review of the proposed projects and their associated costs.

**Explanation:**

After outlining the mitigation measures to be included in the strategy, the local government should describe the method used to prioritize the order in which they intend to implement them.

Prioritization shall include an emphasis on cost-benefit analysis with a focus on how effective the actions are expected to be with respect to their cost.

The action plan should also identify those policies, programs, or resources that can be used to implement the strategy. This section should include the implementation timeline; the funding sources, when possible; and the agency or personnel responsible for carrying out the actions.

**Resource:**

For a detailed description of the development of the action plan, see:

- ✓ *Developing a Mitigation Plan* (FEMA 386-3), Step 3; and
- ✓ *Using Benefit-Cost Analysis in Mitigation Planning* (FEMA 386-5).

**Examples:**



**Original Submittal:**

The City of Sandytown has identified several hazard mitigation measures to be included in the Mitigation Plan. These projects are as follows:

Hazard	Project	Priority
Flooding	▪ Acquisition and relocation of flood-prone structures and repetitive loss properties	High
	▪ Preservation and expansion of open space along the river	Medium

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

Hazard	Project	Priority
Landslides	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determine best management practices (BMP) regarding slope excavation, drainage conveyance, and grading practices that reduce the risk of landslides</li> </ul>	High
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incorporate BMP findings into City ordinance</li> </ul>	High
Tornado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Task force to study shelter design, and reinforcement and anchoring of manufactured homes. Disseminate the information to residents.</li> </ul>	Low
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide funding to residents to help them comply with the above recommendations.</li> </ul>	Low

### REVIEWER'S COMMENTS

DMA SECTION	CORRESPONDING PLAN SECTION	IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED
§201.6(c)(3) (iii)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan does not describe how the projects were prioritized, who will be responsible for implementing them, and it does not identify funding sources.</li> </ul>

#### Required Revisions:

The plan must describe how the mitigation projects were prioritized. The agencies responsible for implementation of the projects should be identified, along with the respective funding sources.



#### Revised Submittal:

The City of Sandytown has identified several hazard mitigation projects to be included in the Hazard Mitigation Plan. **These projects, along with the responsible agency, the funding source, and their priority are listed in the following table.**

**The Planning Group worked with two professors from the Economic and Planning Schools of the local college to evaluate potential projects. The professors and a handful of students completed cost-benefit analyses for each project, providing a cost-benefit ratio, expected present value, and internal rate of return. Each project was judged against these criteria and ranked according to their**

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

greatest cost-benefit ratio, their expected present value, and their internal rate of return. When necessary, the Planning Group also looked at past occurrences and historical trends to aid in assigning priority. The summary of the results is included in the plan as Appendix X.

Hazard	Project	Priority
Flooding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Acquisition and relocation of flood-prone structures and repetitive loss properties</li></ul>	High
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Preservation and expansion of open space along the river</li></ul>	Medium
Landslides	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Determine best management practices (BMP) regarding slope excavation, drainage conveyance, and grading practices that reduce the risk of landslides</li></ul>	High
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Incorporate BMP findings into City ordinance</li></ul>	High
Tornado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Task force to study shelter design, and reinforcement and anchoring of manufactured homes. Disseminate the information to residents.</li></ul>	Low
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Provide funding to residents to help them comply with the above recommendations.</li></ul>	Low

**(THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK)**

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

### MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL MITIGATION STRATEGY

**Requirement §201.6(c)(3) (iv):** For multi-jurisdictional plans, there must be identifiable action items specific to the jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval or credit of the plan.

**Explanation:** The multi-jurisdictional plan should contain a section that links the proposed mitigation actions to the applicable jurisdictions. Any jurisdiction within the planning area requesting approval or credit for the Mitigation Plan must be able to point to specific actions to be pursued.

**Resource:** For more information on the development of the action plan, see:  
✓ *Developing a Mitigation Plan* (386-3), Step 4.

#### Examples:



#### Original Submittal:

Rumble County's Mitigation Plan encompasses several jurisdictions. The following strategies for hazard mitigation within the County were identified to reduce overall damage in the County:

- Buyouts for the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Repetitive Loss Properties located within its boundaries;
- Add a more restrictive clause to the Flood Ordinance to prohibit structures from being built in the floodway; and
- Add an additional building inspector to help identify unpermitted development in the floodplain.

#### REVIEWER'S COMMENTS

DMA SECTION	CORRESPONDING PLAN SECTION	IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED
§201.6(c)(3) (iv)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ The plan does not identify which actions apply to each jurisdiction.</li></ul>

#### Required Revisions:

For a satisfactory score, the plan should list specific actions by jurisdiction.



#### Revised Submittal:

Rumble County's Mitigation Plan encompasses several jurisdictions. Strategies for hazard mitigation within the County were identified to reduce overall damage in the County. **Although these strategies are aimed at**



## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

reducing overall damage in the County, each jurisdiction will be responsible for pursuing the actions that are relevant to that jurisdiction. The jurisdictions, along with the specific actions they will pursue, are listed as follows:

- ~~▪ Buyouts for the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Repetitive Loss Properties located within its boundaries.~~
- ~~▪ Add a more restrictive clause to the Flood Ordinance to prohibit structures from being built in the floodway. .~~
- ~~▪ Add an additional building inspector to help identify unpermitted development in the floodplain. .~~

Jurisdiction	Action	Responsible Agency	Time Frame/ Deadline
Sandy Township	Pursue buyouts for the NFIP Repetitive Loss Properties located within its boundaries	Sandy Township Department of Emergency Services, NFIP Coordinator	Ongoing
City of Rolling Hills	Update flood ordinance to prohibit new development from being built in the floodway	City of Rolling Hills Department of Public Works, Legislative Liaison	Fall 2005
Town of Soggy Bottom	Hire building inspector to identify unpermitted development in the floodplain	Town of Soggy Bottom, Department of Planning and Community Development	Fall 2004

**(THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK)**

## **PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS**

### **PLAN MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES**

§201.6(c)(4) requires a formal plan maintenance process to take place to ensure that the Mitigation Plan remains an active and pertinent document. The plan maintenance process includes a schedule for monitoring and evaluating the plan at least every five years, and continued public participation throughout the plan maintenance process. This section should also include an explanation of how local governments intend to incorporate their mitigation strategies into any existing planning mechanisms they have, such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, or zoning and building codes.

This section includes the following three subsections as follows:

- Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan
- Implementation Through Existing Programs
- Continued Public Involvement

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

### MONITORING, EVALUATING, AND UPDATING THE PLAN

---

**Requirement**  
**§201.6(c)(4)(i):**

[The plan maintenance process shall include a section describing the] method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating, and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle.

**Explanation:**

The local jurisdiction should describe the system it has established to monitor the plan (this system may include periodic reports by agencies involved in implementing projects or activities; site visits, phone calls, and meetings conducted by the person responsible for overseeing the plan; and the preparation of an annual report that captures the highlights of the previously mentioned activities).

The local jurisdiction plan should also include a description of how, when, and by whom the plan will be evaluated, and should include the criteria used to evaluate the plan. The evaluation should assess, among other things, whether:

- The goals and objectives address current and expected conditions.
- The nature or magnitude of risks has changed.
- The current resources are appropriate for implementing the plan.
- There are implementation problems, such as technical, political, legal or coordination issues with other agencies.
- The outcomes have occurred as expected.
- The agencies and other partners participated as proposed.

Ideally, the Plan should be evaluated on an annual basis to determine the effectiveness of programs, and to reflect changes in land development or programs that may affect mitigation priorities. The plan should describe how, when, and under what conditions the plan will be updated and what agencies and interested parties will participate in the update. If plans are not updated annually, the plan should describe the schedule chosen by the community and provide an explanation for that schedule.

**Resource:**

For guidance on the plan maintenance process, see:

- ✓ *Bringing the Plan to Life* (FEMA 386-4).

**Examples:**



**Original Submittal:**

Rocky County has developed a method to ensure that regular review and update of the Hazard Mitigation Plan occurs. The County Planning Department will be responsible for holding annual meetings with local

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

agencies and other concerned parties to evaluate the Mitigation Plan. The Planning Department will then update the plan as necessary. If no changes are required, the County will give the State Hazard Mitigation Officer justification as to why no changes were deemed necessary.

### REVIEWER'S COMMENTS

DMA SECTION	CORRESPONDING PLAN SECTION	IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED
§201.6(c)(4) (i)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ The plan does not include a specific schedule or timeline for the review and evaluation of the plan.</li><li>▪ The local agencies and concerned parties to be included in the evaluation are not identified.</li><li>▪ This section does not describe how the plan will be evaluated.</li></ul>

#### Required Revisions:

The plan should include a firm schedule and timeline for the evaluation of the plan. The local agencies and other concerned parties who will participate in the evaluation should be identified. This section should include a description of how the plan will be evaluated.



#### Revised Submittal:

~~The County Planning Department will be responsible for holding annual meetings with local agencies and other concerned parties to evaluate the Mitigation Plan. The Planning Department will then update the plan as necessary. If no changes are required, the County will give the State Hazard Mitigation Officer justification as to why no changes were deemed necessary.~~

Rocky County has developed a method to ensure that regular review and update of the Hazard Mitigation Plan occurs. The County has formed a Hazard Mitigation Plan Evaluation Committee that consists of members from local agencies and other concerned parties, including elected officials, the County Department of Natural Resources, the County Office of Economic Development, the County Office of Emergency Services, the County DOT, the non-profit Mud River Watershed Society, and representatives from the State University Geography Department. The County Planning Department is responsible for contacting committee members and organizing the annual meeting. The meeting will be held in March of each year, and committee members will be responsible for monitoring and evaluating the progress of the mitigation strategies in the plan.

The committee will review each goal and objective to determine their relevance to changing situations in the County, as well as changes in State or federal policy, and to ensure that they are addressing

## **PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS**

current and expected conditions. The committee will also review the risk assessment portion of the plan to determine if this information should be updated or modified. The parties responsible for the various implementation actions will report on the status of their projects and will include which implementation processes worked well, any difficulties encountered, how coordination efforts were proceeding, and which strategies should be revised.

The Planning Department will then have three months to update and make changes to the plan before submitting it to the Committee members and the State Hazard Mitigation Officer. If no changes are necessary, the State Hazard Mitigation Officer will be given a justification for this determination.

**(THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK)**

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

### IMPLEMENTATION THROUGH EXISTING PROGRAMS

---

**Requirement**  
**§201.6(c)(4) (ii):**

[The plan shall include a] process by which local governments incorporate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate...

**Explanation:**

Jurisdictions should indicate how mitigation recommendations will be integrated into job descriptions, comprehensive plans, capital improvement plans, zoning and building codes, site reviews, permitting, and other planning tools, where such tools are the appropriate vehicles for implementation.

Communities that do not have a comprehensive plan, or other similar planning mechanisms, should explain how the mitigation recommendations would be implemented. Further, for certain mitigation actions that may use other means of implementation, these other tools should be described.

**Resource:**

For more information on integrating hazard mitigation activities in other initiatives, see:

✓ *Getting Started* (FEMA 386-1).

**Examples:**



**Original Submittal:**

Rocky County currently uses comprehensive land use planning, capital improvements planning, and building codes. After the County officially adopts the Hazard Mitigation Plan, these existing mechanisms will have hazard mitigation strategies integrated into them. This will be done so that planning for hazard mitigation will become an essential part of all County decisions and policies.

#### REVIEWER'S COMMENTS

DMA SECTION	CORRESPONDING PLAN SECTION	IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED
§201.6(c)(4) (ii):		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ The plan does not state how planning for hazard mitigation will be incorporated into existing mechanisms, only that it will be done</li></ul>

**Required Revisions:**

The plan must indicate how Mitigation Plan requirements will be incorporated into existing planning mechanisms.



## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

U	N	S/O
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Revised Submittal:

~~Rocky County currently utilizes comprehensive land use planning, capital improvements planning, and building codes. After the County officially adopts the Hazard Mitigation Plan, these existing mechanisms will have hazard mitigation strategies integrated into them. This will be done so that planning for hazard mitigation will become an essential part of all County decisions and policies.~~

**Rocky County currently utilizes comprehensive land use planning, capital improvements planning, and building codes to guide and control development in the County. After the County officially adopts the Hazard Mitigation Plan, these existing mechanisms will have hazard mitigation strategies integrated into them.**

**After adoption of the Mitigation Plan, the County will require that local municipalities address hazards in their comprehensive plans and land use regulations. Specifically, one of the goals in the Mitigation Plan directs County and local governments to protect life and property from natural disasters and man-caused hazards. The County Planning Department will conduct periodic reviews of the County's comprehensive plans and land use policies, analyze any plan amendments, and provide technical assistance to other local municipalities in implementing these requirements.**

**The County Building Department is responsible for administering the building codes in local municipalities. After the adoption of the Mitigation Plan, they will work with the State Building Code Office to make sure that the County adopts, and is enforcing, the minimum standards established in the new State Building Code. This is to ensure that life/safety criteria are met for new construction.**

**The capital improvement planning that occurs in the future will also contribute to the goals in the Hazard Mitigation Plan. The County Natural Resources Department will work with capital improvement planners to secure high-hazard areas for low risk uses.**

**Within six months of the formal adoption of the Mitigation Plan, the policies listed above will be incorporated into the process of existing planning mechanisms.**

## PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

### CONTINUED PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

---

**Requirement**  
**§201.6(c)(4) (iii):**

[The plan maintenance process shall include a] discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

**Explanation:**

The plan should describe what opportunities the broader public (i.e., stakeholders who are not part of the planning team) would have during the plan's periodic review to comment on the progress made to date and the proposed plan revisions. Plans should describe the mechanisms for keeping the public involved (e.g., holding strategic meetings, posting the proposed changes to the plan on the web, etc.)

**Resource:**

For more information on keeping the public involved, see:

- ✓ *Getting Started* (FEMA 386-1) and
- ✓ *Bringing the Plan to Life* (FEMA 386-4).

**Examples:**



**Original Submittal:**

Rocky County is dedicated to involving the public directly in the continual reshaping and updating of the Hazard Mitigation Plan. The Hazard Mitigation Plan Evaluation Committee members are responsible for the annual review and update of the plan. Although they represent the public to some extent, the public will be able to directly comment on and provide feedback about the plan. Several active public outreach projects occurring in the County will enable the public to be involved in all aspects of the planning process.

#### REVIEWER'S COMMENTS

DMA SECTION	CORRESPONDING PLAN SECTION	IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED
§201.6(c)(4) (iii)		▪ The plan does not provide details about the public outreach projects.

**Required Revisions:**

The plan should describe the public outreach projects the County is undertaking, and the mechanisms for keeping the public involved.



**Revised Submittal:**

Rocky County is dedicated to involving the public directly in the continual reshaping and updating of the Hazard Mitigation Plan. The Hazard

## **PART 3 – LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS**

Mitigation Plan Evaluation Committee members are responsible for the annual review and update of the plan. Although they represent the public to some extent, the public will be able to directly comment on and provide feedback about the plan.

~~Several active public outreach projects occurring in the County will enable the public to be involved in all aspects of the planning process.~~

**Copies of the plan will be catalogued and kept on hand at all of the public libraries in the County. The existence and location of these copies will be publicized in the monthly newsletter sent out by the County Chamber of Commerce. Contained in the plan is the address and phone number of County Planning Department Staff Member(s) responsible for keeping track of public comments on the plan.**

**In addition, copies of the plan and any proposed changes will be posted on the County Government website. This site will also contain an email address and phone number to which people can direct their comments or concerns. A link to this site will also be provided on the local Sandy State College Department of Geography and Department of Urban Planning web pages.**

**A public meeting will also be held after each annual Mitigation Plan Evaluation Committee meeting. This meeting will provide the public a forum for which they can express concerns, opinions, or ideas about the plan. The County Planning Department will publicize and host this meeting.**

**(THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK)**